

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,250	09/682,250 08/09/2001		Barry Steven Grant	200-0918 DBK	1872
33481	7590	11/04/2005		EXAMINER	
DANIEL F		VER ROAD	JEANTY, ROMAIN		
SUITE 600				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TROY, MI 48084				3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/682,250	GRANT ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Romain Jeanty	3623					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/9/01.							
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
·	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.	•						
4) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.							
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
	·							
Attachment	(s)	•						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the communication received August 9, 2005. Claims are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 9-14, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aitken et al "Aitken" (US Patent No. 6,577,971) in view of Watkins (Managing Cross-Functional Problem-Solving: A Study Of Liftgate Engineering At Ford of Europe).

As per claims 1, 3, and 13, Aitken discloses a system and method for evaluating craftsmanship. In so doing, Aitken discloses receiving customer data relating to craftsmanship for a vehicle (col. 3, lines 50-62), building a component/system database from the collected customer data (See Figure 10; and col. 2, lines 58-60), rating the vehicle for craftsmanship based on component/system database to obtain an actual rating and setting a target rating for the vehicle based on the actual rating (col. 3, line 63 through col. 4 line 23). Aitken discloses all of the limitations above but fails to expressly disclose identifying craftsmanship issues that resolve

a gap from the actual rating to the target rating, and determining whether the identified

Application/Control Number: 09/682,250

Art Unit: 3623

craftsmanship issues will resolve the gap from the actual rating to the target rating. Watkins in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of resolving gap in a problem solving environment. Note page 1 of Watkins. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Aitken to incorporate the teachings of Watkins in order to determine an action plan for each compliance issue.

As per claim 2, Aitken further discloses a system as set forth in claim 1 including an implementation plan for the craftsmanship issues stored in said computer (col. 2, lines 58-60; and col. 22, lines 16-29).

As per claim 4, Aitken further discloses a system as set forth in claim 1 including means for investigating and analyzing the craftsmanship issues by a supplier and vehicle manufacturer (col. 1, lines 34-53).

As per claim 9, Aitken further discloses a system as set forth in claim 1 including a database of ratings stored in said computer (See Figure 10; and col. 22, lines 30-41).

As per claim 10, Aitken further discloses a system as set forth in claim 1 including a worksheet analysis to identify issues that resolve the gap to the target stored in the computer (col. 22, lines 30-41).

As per claim 11, claim 11 is a method claim corresponding to system 1 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 for the same reason set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 12, claim 12 is a method claim corresponding to system 2 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 for the same reason set forth in claim 2.

As per claim 14, claim 14 is a method claim corresponding to system 4 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 for the same reason set forth in claim 4.

Application/Control Number: 09/682,250

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 19, claim 19 is a method claim corresponding to system 9 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 for the same reason set forth in claim 19.

As per claim 20, claim 20 is a method claim corresponding to system 10 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 for the same reason set forth in claim 10.

4. Claims 5-8, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aitken et al "Aitken" (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,971) in view of Watkins (Managing Cross-Functional Problem-Solving: A Study Of Liftgate Engineering At Ford of Europe) and further in view of Buddle et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,502).

As per claim 5-8, the combination of Aitken and Watkins fails to expressly disclose the limitations of claims 5-8. Buddle on the other hand teaches a system for compliance management for managing compliance issues between users. Note col. 2 line 50 through col. 6 line 21 of Buddle. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Aitken to include the teachings of Buddle with the motivation to identify compliance issues for various business process.

As per claims 15-18, claim 15-18 are method claims corresponding to system claims 5-8 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 for the same reason set forth in claims 5-8.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30 am - 6:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/682,250 Page 5

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 17, 2005

Romain Jeanty Primary Examiner Art Unit 3623